

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 25, 2006. Claims 1, 3 to 6, 9, 10, 12 to 16, 18 to 22, 52 to 54, 58, 59, 61, 69, 71 and 73 to 75 are in the application, with Claim 2 having been cancelled herein. Claims 1 and 75 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 12 to 16, 52 to 54, 61, 69, 73 and 75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,832,298 (Sanchez); Claims 2 to 5, 18 to 22 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sanchez in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,828,992 (Freeman); Claims 58 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sanchez in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,567 (Grefenstette); and Claim 74 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sanchez in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,415 (Brown). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to user interfaces, and more specifically to a user interface apparatus that generates a user interface for a desired device of a plurality of different kinds of devices. Among the many features of the invention, a plurality of functions described in a received device description data is associated with candidates of user interface elements, wherein each of the functions is associated with one or a plurality of candidates of user interface elements, a candidate of each function is selected from the plurality of associated candidates by filtering the candidates based on stored preference data and the sizes of the candidates, and a user interface is generated for a desired device by laying out the candidates of the user interface elements using the selected candidates. In this way, the user interface apparatus is able to provide a user interface based on stored preference data and the sizes of the candidates.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 1 defines a user interface apparatus for providing user interfaces corresponding to each of a plurality of different kinds of devices. The user interface apparatus comprises a data requestor operable to request device description data of a desired device of the plurality of different kinds of devices, the device description data describing a plurality of functions that the desired device is capable of carrying out, a receiver operable to receive the device description data of the desired device from the desired device via a network, and an associator operable to associate the plurality of functions described in the received device description data with candidates of user interface elements, wherein the associator associates each of the functions with one or a plurality of candidates of user interface elements. The user interface apparatus also comprises a preference provider operable to provide pre-stored preference data regarding user interface element preferences, and a selector operable to select a candidate of each function from the plurality of associated candidates by filtering the candidates based on the pre-stored preference data and the sizes of the candidates. The user interface apparatus also comprises a generator operable to generate a user interface for the desired device by laying out the candidates of the user interface elements using the selected candidates, wherein the generator is common to the plurality of different kinds of devices and is operable to generate a user interface for any of the plurality of kinds of devices, and a communicator operable to communicate with the desired device to cause the desired device to carry out a function selected by a user using the user interface generated by the generator.

Independent Claim 75 is directed to a method that generally corresponds to the apparatus of Claim 1.

The applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 1 and 75, and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of selecting a candidate of each function from a plurality of associated candidates by filtering the candidates based on stored preference data and the sizes of the candidates, and generating a user interface for a desired device by laying out the candidates of the user interface elements using the selected candidates.

In entering the rejection of Claim 2, the Office Action concedes that Sanchez does not disclose selecting a candidate from amongst candidates of user interface elements based on the pre-stored preference data, and generating a user interface of a desired device by laying out the selected candidates of the user interface elements. (See Office Action, page 6). Similarly, Applicant submits that Sanchez does not disclose or suggest selecting a candidate of each function from a plurality of associated candidates by filtering the candidates based on stored preference data and the sizes of the candidates, and generating a user interface for a desired device by laying out the candidates of the user interface elements using the selected candidates.

Freeman is seen to disclose an adapter that rearranges options in a user interface “in response to some user pattern of past activity”. (column 1, lines 66 to 67 of Freeman). For example, “the most frequently used buttons, as indicated by their counter values, are clustered and assigned to a top page.” (column 3, line 67 to column 4, line 2). However, Freeman is not seen to disclose or to suggest selecting a candidate of each function from a plurality of associated candidates by filtering the candidates based on stored preference data and the sizes of the candidates, and generating a user interface for a

desired device by laying out the candidates of the user interface elements using the selected candidates.

The remaining applied references, namely Grefenstette and Brown, are not seen to cure the deficiencies of Sanchez and Freeman, either alone or in any permissible combination. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 75 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gregory S. Weaver/
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 53,751

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200